

shown on page 2491, and ending with the name of William Vernon Young, which appears on page 3495.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE PROMOTIONS

The nominations of Jeremiah Edward Sullivan et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 1, 1951, and appear in full in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jeremiah Sullivan, and ending with the name of Lois Ruth Thompson, which are shown on page 1741.

APPOINTMENTS

The nominations of William R. Armstrong et al., for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 21, 1951, and appear in full in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William R. Armstrong, which appears on page 1454, and ending with the name of Bryan E. Zimmerman, which is shown on page 1455.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPOINTMENTS

Rear Adm. Laurance T. DuBose, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years, and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a Presidential order as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Personnel).

Rear Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Medical Corps

Sterling S. Cook Clyde W. Brunson
Warwick T. Brown Charles F. Behrens

Civil Engineer Corps

William O. Hiltabiddle, Jr.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Robert F. Jortberg
Anson C. Perkins

The nominations of Paul F. Abel and other officers of the Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the corps indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 8, 1951, and appear in full in executive proceedings of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Paul F. Abel, appearing on page 1152, and ending with the name of Dorothy Zulick, appearing on page 1154.

The nominations of Richard F. Ballew, Jr., et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 12, 1951, and appear in full in the executive proceedings of the Senate for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Richard F. Ballew, Jr., and ending with the name of George J. Thompson, which appear on page 2270.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

MARCH 22, 1951.

I hereby designate Hon. J. FERCY PRIEST to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose amazing love we cannot fathom, we are again thanking Thee for this Holy Week, commemorating the sufferings and death of our blessed Lord.

We rejoice that when there was no eye to pity, no heart to comfort, and no arm to save, then in the fullness of time Thou didst send Thine only begotten Son and on Good Friday He gave His life upon the cross as a willing and acceptable sacrifice for the salvation of the world.

May we be more eager to share in His glorious mission of releasing the hidden splendor of humanity, emancipating and saving it from everything that defiles and degrades and mars the image of God in which man has been created.

We pray that on Easter Sunday we also may be raised into newness of life and be inspired to build a finer and nobler civilization in which there shall be peace and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name and be with us while we are absent from one another. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to authority granted on March 21, 1951, the Speaker on that date signed the enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 683, an act to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 2, 1951, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 2, 1951, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign

any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 2, 1951, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the said adjournment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 2, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Montana to inform the House what the program will be after the Easter recess?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will be delighted to.

On Monday, April 2, there will be a joint meeting of the House and Senate to hear an address by the President of the Republic of France. After that the Consent Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday, April 3, the Private Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday the manpower draft bill will be considered by the House. Any further program will be announced.

Mr. ARENDS. There will be 4 days of general debate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, 4 days of general debate.

Mr. ARENDS. As the rule provides?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. The bill will not be read for amendment until the following week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938 AS AMENDED

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2615) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 358 of the Agricultural

Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) The national acreage allotment for 1951, less the acreage to be allotted to new farms under subsection (f) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of the larger of the following for each State: (a) The acreage allotted to the State as its share of the 1950 national acreage allotment of 2,100,000 acres, or (b) the State's share of 2,100,000 acres apportioned to States on the basis of the average acreage harvested for nuts in each State in the 5 years, 1945-1949: *Provided*, That any allotment so determined for any State which is less than the 1951 State allotment announced by the Secretary prior to the enactment of this act shall be increased to such announced allotment and the acreage required for such increases shall be in addition to the 1951 national acreage allotment and shall be considered in determining State acreage allotments in future years. For any year subsequent to 1951, the national acreage allotment for that year, less the acreage to be allotted to new farms under subsection (f) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of their share of the national acreage allotment for the most recent year in which such apportionment was made.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Agriculture determines, on the basis of the average yield per acre of peanuts by types during the preceding 5 years, adjusted for trends in yields and abnormal conditions of production affecting yields in such 5 years, that the supply of any type or types of peanuts for any marketing year, beginning with the 1951-1952 marketing year, will be insufficient to meet the estimated demand for cleaning and shelling purposes at prices at which the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell for such purposes peanuts owned or controlled by it, the State allotments for those States producing such type or types of peanuts shall be increased to the extent determined by the Secretary to be required to meet such demand but the allotment for any State may not be increased under this provision above the 1947 harvested acreage of peanuts for such State. The total increase so determined shall be apportioned among such States for distribution among farms producing peanuts of such type or types on the basis of the average acreage of peanuts of such type or types in the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which the allotments are being determined. The additional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment, the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota, and the increase in acreage allotted under this provision shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, or farm acreage allotments."

"2. Subsection (d) is amended by changing the second sentence to read as follows:

"(d) The State acreage allotment for 1952 and any subsequent year shall be apportioned among farms on which peanuts were produced in any one of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year for which such apportionment is made, on the basis of the following: Past acreage of peanuts, taking into consideration the acreage allotments previously established for the farm; abnormal conditions affecting acreage; land, labor, and equipment available for the production of peanuts; crop-rotation practices; and soil and other physical factors affecting the production of peanuts."

"3. Add new subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary may, if

the State committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will facilitate the effective administration of the provisions of the act, provide for the apportionment of the State acreage allotment for 1952 and any subsequent year among the counties in the State on the basis of the past acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts (excluding acreage in excess of farm allotments) in the county during the 5 years immediately preceding the year in which such apportionment is made, with such adjustments as are deemed necessary for abnormal conditions affecting acreage, for trends in acreage, and for additional allotments for types of peanuts in short supply under the provisions of subsection (c). The county acreage allotment shall be apportioned among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (d) of this section.

"(f) Not more than 1 percent of the national acreage allotment shall be apportioned among farms on which peanuts are to be produced during the calendar year for which the allotment is made but on which peanuts were not produced during any 1 of the past 3 years, on the basis of the following: Past peanut-producing experience by the producers; land, labor, and equipment available for the production of peanuts; crop-rotation practices; and soil and other physical factors affecting the production of peanuts.

"(g) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms under the provisions of this section on which peanuts will not be produced and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county receiving allotments, in amounts determined by the county committee to be fair and reasonable on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of peanuts, crop-rotation practices, and soil and other physical factors affecting the production of peanuts. Any transfer of allotments under this provision shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred, except as the farm becomes ineligible for an allotment by failure to produce peanuts during a 3-year period, and any such transfer shall not operate to increase the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm to which the acreage is transferred: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm, and reapportioned as provided herein.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the allotment determined or which would have been determined for any land which is removed from agricultural production in 1950 or any subsequent year for any purpose because of acquisition by any Federal, State, or other agency having a right of eminent domain shall be placed in a pool and shall be available for use in providing equitable allotments for farms owned or acquired by owners displaced because of acquisition of their farms by such agencies. Upon application to the county committee, within 5 years from the date of such acquisition of the farm, any owner so displaced shall be entitled to have an allotment for any other farm owned or operated by him equal to an allotment which would have been determined for such other farm plus the allotment which would have been determined for the farm so acquired: *Provided*, That such allotment shall not exceed 50 percent of the acreage of cropland on the farm.

"The provisions of this section shall not be applicable if (a) there is any marketing quota penalty due with respect to the marketing of peanuts from the farm acquired by the Federal, State, or other agency or by

the owner of the farm; (b) any peanuts produced on such farm have not been accounted for as required by the Secretary; or (c) the allotment next established for the farm acquired by the Federal, State, or other agency would have been reduced because of false or improper identification of peanuts produced on or marketed from such farm."

"Sec. 2. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Subsection (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no refund of any penalty shall be made because of peanuts kept on the farm for seed or for home consumption.'

"2. Subsection (g) is amended by (1) adding after '1947' in the first sentence the words 'or 1948, if no peanuts were harvested on the farm in 1947,' (2) striking out after the word 'That,' where it first appears in the proviso, the following words: 'for the 1950 crop,' and (3) by inserting the following new sentences after the fifth sentence: 'As an alternative to designated agencies paying the prevailing oil value for such excess peanuts of any type in insufficient supply and the subsequent distribution of sales proceeds therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may also authorize peanut buyers approved pursuant to regulations of the Secretary to purchase such peanuts from producers at prices not less than those at which such peanuts may be sold for cleaning and shelling by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In the event of such authorization by the Secretary, producers shall have the option of either delivering such peanuts to designated agencies or selling such peanuts to approved peanut buyers, and such sales to approved buyers shall have the same effect, with respect to avoidance of the marketing penalty and classification of producers as cooperators, as deliveries to designated agencies.'

"Sec. 3. The first sentence of section 363 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm marketing quota may, within 15 days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 362, have such quota reviewed by a local review committee composed of three farmers from the same or nearby counties appointed by the Secretary.'

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting reading of the Senate amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be waived.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know what those amendments are.

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad to make an explanation of them.

Mr. RANKIN. The cotton farmers have been abused so much that I think we ought to scrutinize this matter carefully.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman from North Carolina will explain exactly what the situation is.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to agree to vote on these amendments until we hear them read. Now, the cotton farmers have been betrayed enough in this country, and I do not intend to sit here and take any chances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object to dispensing with the reading of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk concluded the reading of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. BURLESON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the procedural situation? As I understand, the House passed this bill some few weeks ago and sent it over to the Senate. There everything was stricken after the enacting clause and the bill known as the Farm Bureau bill was substituted. Is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. That bill was drafted after representatives of the Farm Bureau from the peanut-growing areas had a meeting here in Washington and conferred with officials of the Department of Agriculture. After that sort of collaboration they drafted this bill.

As the gentleman knows, the original purpose of the bill H. R. 2615 was twofold: First, to permit the peanut growers in Virginia and North Carolina to increase their acreage in peanuts so that production would meet reasonable consumer demand. In our bill we gave the Secretary of Agriculture the right if he found that any type of peanut was in short supply to increase the acreage, so that we would not continue to have a scarcity but would have an abundance and a sufficiency to meet the requirements of the trade.

That provision apparently is not controversial at all. Everybody seemed to agree that it would be unreasonable for us to continue a program that brought about a scarcity of a valuable and vital food commodity. So that is one provision of the bill that I do not believe anybody has objected to, because it does liberalize acreage, and it liberalized it under our bill in an unlimited fashion.

Mr. BURLESON. It was recognized, or at least that is my impression, by everyone interested in this legislation that the States of Alabama and Texas were receiving unequal and inequitable treatment under the 1948 law, and that the bill as passed by this House attempted to a considerable degree to make adjustments which would take care of those inequities. As I understand, this amendment of the other body cuts that consideration for Alabama and Texas just about in half. Is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. When the program for 1950 was laid out, it was discovered for the first time that the States of Alabama and Texas would suffer an injustice and would receive an inequitable allotment, so the House, in fact, both Houses of Congress, passed a bill which corrected that inequitable situation for the year 1950.

Then later in the session, I think in August of last year, the House committee reported another bill which sought to correct that inequity on a permanent basis. The House passed that bill and we sent it to the Senate. There it was permitted to die. So we came back this session and brought in this bill for the one purpose, as I say, of liberalizing the acreage in certain areas and correcting the inequity in the gentleman's State and in the State of Alabama.

When that went to the Senate, the Senate did just what the gentleman suggested. They approved in substance the part of the bill relating to the Virginia-North Carolina area, but they cut just about in half the provisions which were made for Texas and Alabama.

Mr. BURLESON. Let me further inquire of the gentleman as to the situation we now face here on the floor today. As I understand, the other body has sent their bill back here with a refusal even to hold a conference on the measure. Is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct on that. We were advised by the Parliamentarian that this was unprecedented action on the part of the other body.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if I fully expressed myself on this matter, I would be violating the rules of the House as well as the rules of common courtesy and decency. A dictatorial action of this sort should not be tolerated by this House. I am not permitted to call names, I understand, under the rules, but I understand that a Senator—that a Member of the other body, not even a member of the Committee on Agriculture—

Mr. COOLEY. If I may interrupt the gentleman, he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BURLESON. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture? They do not need any others under this kind of procedure.

He says we shall not be allowed to even make an effort to talk this thing over in any respect, and, as the gentleman has said, as far as I know, there is no precedent for it.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield to me, it is even more deplorable when we realize that even in the debate they recognized the fact that they were dealing with an injustice.

Mr. BURLESON. And they admitted it.

Mr. COOLEY. Something happened in Alabama and Texas that no human being ever intended should happen, and the debate shows that they realized we were trying to correct an inequity, and yet they said we will only go halfway and will not even talk about going any further.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I strongly observe: Of all human characteristics which are abominable, I know of nothing worse than superciliousness, which is obviously the attitude of the particular Member of the other body responsible for this situation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me we are faced with a situation where a creditor owes us \$10 and he comes in and says, "I have the money, but I am not going to pay you more than \$5."

The other body of this Congress said in plain words that they owed us 79,000 acres, but would only pay us 34,800 acres, and said, "That is as far as we care to go, and consequently we will not ask for conferees." But we are now faced with

a situation at the other end of the Capitol which makes it impossible to carry out the kind of discussions based on mutual respect, which have long characterized the relations between the two Houses. Under these conditions we probably had better take the best deal you can get. It seems to me that we better take what we can get out of this thing and quit asking to talk with people who do not want to discuss public matters with members of the lower House.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words we can take it or leave it.

Mr. BURLESON. We in the Southern States and in the Southwest are in the position now that we must begin the planting of peanuts in the next few weeks. We do not have any more time and we are going to run the risk of losing the little bit which we have gained; and that is the situation with which we are faced right now.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. If the bill does not pass, the planting time will be on us before we come back in session.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that this moral bankruptcy did not start over at the other end of the Capitol. This entire bill is simply a regimentation of the farmers of the South. They are trying to drive the little farmers out of this field as they did last year and year before last by limiting his acreage to such a small amount that he could not raise enough cotton to pay his taxes, and they refused to let him plant any peanuts or tobacco at all. This is communistic regimentation and it ought not to pass either House of Congress.

I am going to object to the consideration of the amendments.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I have always appreciated the views of the gentleman from Mississippi, but I cannot agree with his approach on this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to see my farmers mistreated this way by either the House of Representatives or the Senate. The House bill was bad enough, and this one is worse.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi withhold his objection and permit me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] withhold his objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference. Merely because it minimizes the crime a small amount does not appeal to me. The whole thing ought to go over until after the recess, or until the next Congress or the next Congress after that if this regimentation of the farmers is going to continue.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection and let me make one observation?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. I have heard the gentleman's observation, but I will hear it again.

Mr. COOLEY. The observation is this: I know the gentleman objects to certain programs which are now in operation. But here is an effort on our part to at least agree with the gentleman from Mississippi in some fashion. In other words, we are liberalizing the acreage in the States.

Mr. RANKIN. The farmers would be better off if we let this legislation die. You men should go home and see the farmers, let them see you, and then write another bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman understand that if he objects to this bill, the peanut program goes on with all of its inequities, and it goes on with all of its financial burdens, and it will go on without any relief whatsoever for the farmers in Texas and Alabama or for the consuming public?

Mr. RANKIN. Do not ask me to underwrite the crime because you imagine you are making it a little less by perpetuating it.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman objects, the program will go on without any relief in the acreage program.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to object to the consideration of this measure at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COOLEY. Apparently the gentleman does not want to understand the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I know as much about it, and probably more, too, than does the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Perhaps the gentleman thinks he does.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, to summarize the present dilemma, the action taken on H. R. 2615 by the other body is, as far as I can determine, without precedence in our legislative procedures. It is difficult to conceive that the membership of the other body is aware of what has taken place. Therefore it may not be considerate to condemn the Senate as a body, but rather the dictatorial attitude of a few Members who I understand to be responsible for this action which is an insult and an outrage to the House of Representatives.

The supercilious attitude of one Member, is, as I understand it, responsible for the situation we face at the moment. Mr. Speaker, the Member of the other body who has blocked legislation passed by the House, and who says in a dictatorial manner that here is the bill you will pass or you will have none at all, is a former Secretary of Agriculture who apparently assumes to have all the answers and no one else can possibly know anything about it.

We find ourselves here in the position of accepting his dictates or not having any legislation at all which will, to a considerable degree, cure inequities existing in the 1948 law.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as passed by the House corrected to a considerable degree, inequities existing in the original law as applied to the States of Alabama and Texas. The bill as passed by the Senate and now before us, with the order that they will refuse to confer or to consider any sort of compromise, reduces that corrected inequity to about one-half. From the debate and various sources of

information, everyone concerned seems to realize and admit that such inequities exists, but now they say they will correct a wrong half way, but not willing to correct it any further.

This bill vitally affects the small peanut farmers in my congressional district. Under the House bill, Texas would have received approximately 35,000 additional acres, the greater part of which would have benefitted peanut farmers in my district. Under the amendment of the Senate, a 20-acre peanut farmer in my district may receive an acre or two more than his present allotment, but he has already been so reduced that it will be extremely difficult for him to make a living. The merits of this measure were discussed in the debate at the time we passed the bill, and there is no need to restate or argue them here at this time, but it should be made known who is responsible for this action. If we refuse to accept the amendment before us, we stand to lose that little which we have gained, but to accept it under duress and threat of having no legislation at all is contrary to all the principles of legislative procedures and is an insult to this House which, I hope, it will not soon forget.

Since the gentleman from Mississippi is unrelenting in objection to the consideration of the Senate amendment, I hope something can be worked out when the House reconvenes week after next. The action which should be taken of course, is a more reasonable attitude of the other body and particularly the individual over there who has obstructed justice. There is no more room for would-be dictators around here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] object?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am not going to stand for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

THE McMAHON RESOLUTION IS ONE STEP FORWARD AND ONE STEP BACKWARD

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the McMahon resolution of friendship with Russia is one step forward and one step backward. It holds out the hand of friendship to the peoples of the Soviet Union, which is good. Then it holds the hand of welcome out to the bloody masters of the Kremlin who are enslaving the peoples of the Soviet Union, which is bad.

The McMahon resolution says:

The American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government.

In other words it seeks agreement with Stalin.

Suppose the American Communist leaders, William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, Jack Stachel, and their co-conspirators

had succeeded in taking over the Government of the United States and after a period of 33 years had imposed a complete police state in this country and then had perpetrated the murders of about 40,000,000 of the best American citizens. How sincerely would we ordinary Americans regard a gesture of friendship from a foreign power that was coupled with an attempt to come to agreement with our enslavers?

Thirty-three years. That happens to be the life span of the man-God, Whose death we commemorate tomorrow and Whose resurrection we commemorate Sunday, Whom Stalin and his politburo would like to exterminate from the world.

THE DEFENSE EFFORT

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, just how sincere are we in our determination to win the battle against communism?

We cannot win it by relaxing our effort when the going looks good.

Today in Korea our troops are winning. As a result here at home we are slowing down our effort.

Only last week, for example, the House killed a rule to even consider housing for defense workers.

The Soviet Union possesses some atomic bombs. The Soviet Union possesses atomic reactors. The Soviet Union has plunged into the atomic energy business with great resources and hard-driving determination. They mean to challenge our lead in the atomic energy field. Nothing must prevent us from keeping our lead and increasing it.

Necessary expansion of our atomic program depends on two important plants—Savannah River, S. C., and Paducah, Ky. These are hard hit by the refusal of the House to act on defense housing.

This year 6,000 construction workers will be needed at Savannah River; 10,000 at Paducah.

Where are we going to house them?

And, without housing, how are we going to get workers for these projects?

In other fields we are also taking a complacent attitude to our defense problems.

A competent defense program cannot be turned on and off like a water faucet. It is a long-range job; it is costly; and it will tire us, but there is no easy way to win the fight against communism.

WHAT IS THE REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Republican national chair-

man, Guy Gabrielson, stated that what this country needs is a definite foreign policy and furthermore, he said, his party had one.

I have since been trying to determine what that one, definite, foreign policy is. Mr. Hoover says we should send no divisions to Europe, Mr. Dewey says as many as are necessary should be sent. Mr. WHERRY says six divisions, or 20 percent of our total, or 10 percent of the European total. One Republican leader says our responsibility is in the West, another says it is in the East. Another says we have no responsibility. Senator TART says, on one occasion, that President Truman is trying to force us into war with Russia, and, another, that President Truman is guilty of appeasement. One Republican leader holds that sending troops to Europe without congressional approval is clearly unconstitutional, another that it would be unconstitutional to impose such a condition.

Some weeks ago on the floor of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], after listening to various positions on foreign policy questions taken by leading Republicans, stated that he did not agree with any of them. This is difficult to understand, as it appears from the record, that every possible position has been taken by at least one Republican. This may be the one definite policy to which the national chairman, Mr. Gabrielson, refers, namely: to take every possible position, so that no matter what develops, some Republican will have been right at least once and the rest can rally round him.

The whole confused picture reminds me of the famous caucus race in Alice in Wonderland. The race, as you may recall, was conducted under the direction of the Dodo. Its purpose was to dry off the characters who were all wet. First the Dodo marked out a race course in a sort of a circle—"the exact shape doesn't matter," it said—and then all the party were placed along the course, here and there. There was no one, two, three, and away, but all began running when they liked and left off when they liked. Apparently it made no difference either, as to what direction they took. It was not easy to know when the race was over. However, after they had all been running for some time, the Dodo suddenly called out "the race is over." All of the runners then crowded around, panting and asking, "But who has won."

The Dodo could not find an easy answer. It considered and deliberated for a long time, and at last announced "Everybody has won, and all must have prizes."

It seems to me that this is the only possible outcome of the present contradictory and confused Republican foreign policy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of all matters on the Speaker's desk and any other previous orders I may address the House for 5 minutes in order to correct the RECORD of yesterday in respect to certain things in a colloquy between the chairman of the Ap-

propriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday, April 3, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BATTLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BIG TALK, LITTLE ACTION

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, perhaps my remarks may be construed as crying over spilled milk, but those who may so regard them, I refer to the words of President Roosevelt, Republican Theodore Roosevelt, that is, who said that we should cry over spilled milk so that we do not make the same mistakes again.

Prior to the House debate on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill we heard a great deal yesterday and the day before of shouting about economy in the Federal Government, but by late yesterday afternoon the shouting had dwindled to an almost inaudible whisper. After the Appropriations Committee had cut the bill by something like 1.3 percent, the House by a tremendous effort, an effort that was vigorously opposed by the leadership of the majority party, succeeded in additionally cutting the measure less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

As the Pottawatomie Indians used to say in Waukesha, Wis., "Big talk, no doo."

CODE OF ETHICS FOR OFFICIALS OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and I are today introducing identical bills to establish a bipartisan, independent commission to make a study and recommend a code of morality and ethics applicable to the conduct of all appointed and elected officials of the United States Government. The disclosures made in recent hearings before congressional

committees have shocked the American people.

We, like many other Members of Congress, have been deluged with communications calling upon official Washington to take immediate and drastic steps to clean house.

Perhaps this should be done by congressional committees. On the other hand, the obvious objection to that procedure is that they might be loath to sit in judgment on the conduct of their own Members. For that reason, we feel that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of an official bipartisan commission made up of private citizens who will delve into this matter and let the chips fall where they may.

We recognize that the vast majority of public officials, both appointed and elected, regardless of political affiliation, are honorable and upright men and women. However, the recent disclosures by congressional committees indicate that there are those in positions of trust in Government who are completely lacking in the basic understanding of fundamental principles of honesty and ethics. If not actively dishonest, they are at least willing to shut their eyes completely to dishonorable acts by those surrounding them.

We thoroughly appreciate the difficulty of legislating integrity and faithfulness to trust. On the other hand, many professional groups, notably the legal and medical professions, have adopted codes of ethics governing the conduct of their members which are nearly as effective as actual statutory law.

Nothing could be more important than that officials of the Government, whether appointed or elected, retain the confidence and respect of the American people whom they serve. This objective will never be achieved by shutting our eyes to the disturbing evidence of disintegration in the moral fiber of many in positions of responsibility.

With spurious political ideologies threatening the very destiny of freedom, it is urgent that the faith of the people be restored in our republican form of government. The basis of this faith is confidence in the men and women elected or appointed to high position. Such confidence has been badly shaken. Honesty and integrity are old-fashioned words easily defined, but it is high time that their full significance be clearly and firmly restated.

RUBBER

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, rubber, an indispensable material in peace or war, is of utmost importance to the welfare of many thousands of men and women and to a substantial segment of industry in the Fourteenth Congressional District in Ohio.

I, therefore, direct your attention to the present situation in the rubber manufacturing industry brought about by the curtailment, by Government order, of the use of all types of rubbers under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The original order has been followed by further restrictions designed to control rubber consumption, and has resulted in lay-offs, shorter hours for those who are employed, as well as cut-backs in the production of tires and thousands of other rubber products for civilian uses.

It is not my intention to question the need of a strategic national stockpile of rubber for defense. The vital importance of rubber to our economy and to our Armed Forces was established for all time during the grim days of World War II.

I do, however, call for a reexamination and a reappraisal of the national rubber stockpile objective, the goal which has been set up for the accumulation of rubbers. Rapidly changing events now indicate that world supplies of crude rubber will this year exceed the all-time high of 1,850,000 tons available in 1950.

The present rate of Government rubber stockpiling for strategic purposes should be studied now that production of American rubbers in Government and private facilities is rapidly increasing, and full-scale operation should be attained in these plants during the next 60 days.

There is no justifiable reason to impair our civilian economy at this critical period in our history to provide for luxury in rubber in the event of a war which may not occur. An unrealistic rubber stockpile objective, or an unnecessarily high rate of acquisition of rubber for stockpiling purposes, are not in the best interests of the Nation's current or long-range welfare.

It has been reported that our Government is presently giving consideration to long-term, fixed-price commitments, or contracts for the purchase of crude or tree rubber, from rubber-producing nations and foreign private producers.

It now appears that the world supply of new rubber in 1951 will be the largest in history, about 2,800,000 tons. Estimated world requirements for new rubber in 1951 are said to be approximately 2,175,000 tons, indicating a surplus of 625,000 tons. It is in this area that fear buying of rubber stocks, mainly for strategic purposes, may find nations bidding against each other with further inflationary effects upon the crude-rubber market.

In light of a probable world surplus in rubber our Nation should avoid arrangements with crude-rubber producers that would legalize the great price inflation in crude rubber that has cost American consumers, manufacturers, and our Government hundreds of millions of dollars in recent months. I would remind you that the price of crude rubber increased from 18¼ cents a pound in January 1950 to 90 cents a pound late last year, an increase of nearly 400 percent.

In the interests of a sound national rubber policy, with adequate provisions

for military and civilian security, it is now evident that appropriate agencies of Government, and our Armed Forces, should reevaluate the strategic rubber stockpile objective, and the present rate of purchases for that stockpile, at the same time avoiding rubber price agreements with nations, or with private crude-rubber producers.

It is my personal opinion that far too little consideration is being given by national planners to the fact that the foundation of our military, industrial, and political strength is a sound and virile domestic economy.

National security in rubber can be assured only through providing adequate supplies of rubber in peace as well as in war. Per capita consumption of new rubber in the United States last year was 18 pounds compared with the per capita consumption for the rest of the world of approximately 1 pound.

One of the soundest business transactions this Nation ever made was the establishment of American facilities for producing man-made rubbers in substantial volume when considered in terms of our steadily increasing demands for the material.

Ten years ago American rubber independence seemed a priceless, distant goal to most Americans, for the Far East supplied nearly 97 percent of our total requirements for rubber.

The facilities we erected of necessity in the United States for production of rubber on a large scale during World War II have proved an investment of vital importance to our military security and to our national economy.

In terms of direct savings, it is estimated that since the end of World War II, man-made rubber has saved American consumers at least \$2,500,000,000.

From a standing start in 1942, our Nation was, by May 1945, producing rubbers at a rate of 1,000,000 long tons a year, an industrial achievement without parallel and without which, military men have stated, the war could not have been won.

We must not sell our American rubber-making facilities short. Rather we should exert every effort to increase the output of these facilities and, if necessary, expand them to provide additional insurance in terms of rubber for any eventuality.

Products made of American rubbers are constantly being improved and the rubber industry reports that these relatively new materials can today replace crude rubber much more effectively than in World War II.

In summary, I urge that we make certain that no more rubber than is absolutely essential is diverted into the stockpile; that Government not commit this Nation to contracts calling for fantastically high prices for crude rubber and that the production of American rubbers be increased.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR OFFICIALS OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, as has just been pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] he and I are today introducing similar bills to set up a bipartisan commission to make a study and establish a code of ethics for those appointed and elected to public office. We can all appreciate the fact that there is great difficulty in legislating integrity and faithfulness to trust; on the other hand, professional groups such as the legal profession and the medical profession have adopted codes of ethics governing the conduct of their members that are nearly as effective as actual statutory law.

Nothing can be more important than that officials of the Government, whether appointed or elected, retain the confidence and respect of the American people.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been asked from time to time to appropriate large sums of money for the Voice of America. I question this vast expenditure because the benefit is very questionable. Yesterday I was privileged to witness the Senate crime investigation hearings in New York over television. My conclusion was this, that the Voice of America should be made available to Americans and let them see and hear the unadulterated truth of what goes on behind the scenes in this great Republic of ours. Let them know and see those enemies who are boring from within with political corruption. If this is done with all hearings where suspected fraud and crime have been committed against our Republic, enlightened people will go to the polls and cast an intelligent ballot.

COMMUNIST EXPOSURE

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and as an American citizen, I feel it not only a duty but a privilege as well, to commend a fellow-American, Larry Parks, on the testimony that he gave yesterday before our committee. It was refreshing to me to hear a great actor tell of his experiences as a Communist. Larry Parks is the first member of his profession whom I have felt told the truth about the treacherous techniques that are used by the enemies of constitutional government. His courage in admitting that he had been a member of

the Communist Party, although he knew that it would bring unfavorable publicity to him, is to be admired. His willingness to cooperate with the Un-American Activities Committee shows that he is a loyal and true American.

Larry Parks is a great actor. He has brought a tremendous amount of pleasure into the lives of millions of people. He is a fellow-alumnus of mine from the University of Illinois, one of America's great educational institutions. I look forward to the next theatrical production in which Larry Parks appears and I hope that all my friends will likewise recognize him as one of the outstanding entertainers of our age.

As for Howard da Silva and Gale Sondergaard, who also testified or rather refused to testify before the committee yesterday, I can only say that by their testimony they represented all that is opposed to the best interests of our country. They absolutely refused to cooperate with the committee. I shall ask that both these witnesses, Da Silva and Sondergaard, be cited for contempt of Congress and for contempt of the American people.

RUSSIA BLUNTLY REFUSES RETURN OF 670 SHIPS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a news item appearing in the morning Post should be of some interest to the Members. The headlines of the item state that Russia bluntly refuses return of 670 ships. The story goes on to say that Russia told the United States that it refuses to consider the return of the ships. Soviet Ambassador Panyushkin is quoted as saying that the lend-lease vessels are not needed by the United States.

Included in the 670 ships are 84 merchant vessels built during the war in our shipyards at a cost of one million to one and one-half million dollars each. Also included are 556 naval craft such as tugs, torpedo boats, mine sweepers, landing craft, and 30 military water craft such as barges and tankers. How many hundreds of millions of dollars they cost the United States I do not know.

The attitude of Soviet Russia in the matter does not surprise us greatly. It is in keeping with its attitude in all other matters generally. But what does surprise me is the attitude of our own departments and agencies of Government. I thought we had abandoned our policy of appeasement, but apparently I am mistaken. Let me cite an illustration. Yesterday when we had the Treasury Department appropriation bill before the House we were told that this Department protects American industry from imports of foreign products. That statement is subject to challenge. A Federal law provides that the Treasury Department may prohibit

the importation into this country of any foreign product produced by slave or forced labor. Authoritative sources inform us that there are from 10,000,000 to 14,000,000 people in slave labor or forced camps in the Soviet empire. We are further informed that many of these laborers are employed in producing or processing furs. During the past 5 years we have imported about \$190,000,000 worth of furs from Soviet Russia. These imports have driven thousands of American fur farmers out of business. Furthermore, Russia has been enabled to obtain dollar credits with which to purchase strategic war materials.

During the hearings and debate on the reciprocal-trade legislation the State Department said that we could do nothing about such imports. I am more surprised at the attitude of the State and Treasury Departments than I am at that of Russia. Under the Federal law which I referred to something can be done. The Treasury Department can prohibit these imports. Yet it has thus far refused to do so. The two departments are still following the same appeasement policy which has failed us so miserably in the past, and which has contributed so much to the present sad state of world affairs. When are they going to get out of the rut and abandon the policy of which the American people quite clearly disapprove?

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is presently considering Reorganization Plan No. 1, to substitute for the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a single Administrator.

The policy committees of the Republican Party in both the Senate and the House have indicated that they favor the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and some of the testimony before the Senate committee has been to that general effect.

I wish to urge that, before the Congress passes upon this rather basic policy, we ought to consider three things:

First, small business is denied adequate financing from private sources of credit for long-term loans on fixed assets.

Second, in the period of conversion to defense production, which we now face, there will inevitably be dislocations resulting in shut-downs and unemployment. I predict that need will be found, particularly for small business enterprises, to have financial assistance in that conversion period. For many of these smaller concerns the only available source of credit will be the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or some similar public agency.

Third, loans will be necessary to finance facilities to be used in connection with defense production. The argument has been advanced that there is no need for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to perform this defense-lending function, since authority to make such loans now exist in the Defense Production Administration.

I wish to draw the attention of the House of Representatives to the hearings currently in progress before the Hardy subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. These hearings have disclosed that 1 of the 19 loans made by the Defense Production Administration was that to the Hazelton Steel & Tubing Corp. In this case a loan of nearly \$8,000,000 was granted to a newly formed company, in which the capital stock was owned solely by three individuals and represented an investment on their part of only \$600.

I think the Congress should be aware that the staff and other facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are utilized by the Defense Production Administration for the processing of loan applications, in the preparation and execution of loan documents, the disbursement of funds, and the servicing of defense production loans. I believe it also should be said that, to the credit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the application for the loan to the Hazelton Steel & Tubing Corp., was disapproved at all echelons, both in the field agency and in the Washington office, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Refusal was recommended on the ground that the loan was unsound.

However, notwithstanding the recommendations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which were based upon facts and engineering considerations, the Defense Production Administration, which made no independent investigation of the facts, not only recommended a huge loan, but also approved certificates of necessity, allowing accelerated amortization of the facilities to be acquired.

I know of no loan granted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which can possibly compare in unsoundness to the Defense Production Administration's loan to the Hazelton Steel & Tubing Corp.

I simply wish to issue a caveat, at this time, that the Congress ought to refrain from hasty action with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, proceeding from an emotionally charged atmosphere generated by the Fulbright hearings. Instead, the Congress ought to consider carefully and thoroughly the role of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in our national economy under emergency-production conditions, before any far-reaching policies are enacted.

PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington just referred to the attitude of the Russian Government in refusing to return our ships. We have seen a good deal of that spirit exhibited in the Congress in the last 2 or 3 days. We saw that attitude exhibited in another body by its refusal to consider or to discuss with us important legislation. This morning we have seen the same attitude on the floor of the House where we have been denied the opportunity to bring up that same bill and to concur in Senate amendments.

I wish we might discuss these amendments, but the Members of another body have said, "Take what we have offered on our debt to Texas and Alabama, or sue us, and if you sue us, we will plead bankruptcy, but under no circumstances will we talk with you." I submit there is a striking similarity between this attitude and the attitude of the Russians in regard to the return of our ships. Now we are faced with an equally uncooperative attitude from the floor of this House. The gentleman from Mississippi says that he is "opposed to the regimentation of the farmer." The bill we seek to bring before the House increases, not decreases, the liberty of the farmer, but the distinguished gentleman, like the distinguished Members of the other body, says if the bill is not in every respect what I would like to have, I forbid you to consider it.

Those of us who have worked with this peanut problem have tried to get some relief for the peanut growers. We have tried to maintain a program that would not break down either because it cut the peanut acreage too low and denied the public an adequate supply of peanuts, or because it raised the acreage too high and burdened the Government with an excessive surplus of peanuts. We have tried to write legislation which would allow the producers of North Carolina and Virginia to produce all the jumbo peanuts the trade demands. At the same time we have tried to give the growers of peanuts in Texas and Alabama exactly the same treatment that we have accorded all other peanut producers. The present law imposes a greater percentage cut in those two States than in any others. The House bill corrects this admitted injustice and corrects it in full. The Senate bill corrects only one-half of the injustice—and the distinguished gentleman who had charge of the bill in the other body admitted this. In fact he stated:

In the House bill there was provision for 79,000 acres increase for Texas and Alabama to correct an injustice heretofore existing. The Senate bill reduces that acreage to 34,900.

Then he added:

This acreage relates to peanuts for oil purposes.

In this statement the distinguished Senator was mistaken. This acreage was not assigned on any basis of the end use of the peanuts. Actually all peanuts planted in Texas are Spanish peanuts. The bulk of them go into peanut butter, roasted peanuts, and so forth. In other words, most of them are used for edible

purposes. Of course, the lower grades are crushed into oil just as are the lower grades of Virginia peanuts. After pointing out that an injustice involving 79,000 acres exists at the present time, the distinguished gentleman summed up the attitude of the other body by saying:

Furthermore, I may say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided that this (34,900 acres) was as far as they wish to go, and therefore it is not desired or intended to ask for the appointment of conferees, but to let the matter rest on the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee.

What, my colleagues, is the essential difference between this attitude and the attitude of a debtor who owes me \$79, and who says, "I admit the debt, but I will pay you \$34.90. This is as far as I wish to go, and, therefore, I do not propose to discuss the matter further."

Faced with this flat repudiation of a governmental obligation, we in the House felt that we could take what was offered or take nothing. My personal inclination was to leave the offer open in the hope that the other body might a little later at least talk to us, but the planting season is at hand. My friends have urged that a half loaf is better than no loaf. We of the Agriculture Committee have, therefore, felt it might be better to take this bill up and accept the Senate amendments now and seek a full and final settlement of this debt at a future time, but when we attempted to do so, we were met with the objection of the gentleman from Mississippi who in turn says, I will not allow the House to accept any offer. In the meantime, the peanut growers suffer, and before long, we are likely to see the ridiculous situation of American consumers being unable to buy the peanuts they want and at the same time the Government forbidding producers to grow the wanted peanuts. When this situation develops, I hope no one will be so unkind as to say that the Farm Bloc should have foreseen the situation. There are those here today who do foresee the situation, and we are trying to prevent it, but we seem to be faced with the same kind of refusal to discuss or allow discussion that meets our negotiators who have sought to secure the return of the ships mentioned by the gentleman from Washington.

PEANUT-ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, in the further interest of this bill, of the gentleman from Mississippi to ascertain whether or not he would be constrained to withdraw his objection if we could agree to the amendment with an amendment which would limit the operation of this bill for 1 year?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I think the bill should go over until after the recess. I think we ought to turn some sunlight in on it. The American farmers need to know what is being done to them. I

resent this attitude, and the silly speech made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] just now just indicates the stupidity that is written into this bill.

So I am not going to agree to it. You are doing the farmers infinite harm. I am going to reply to these statements in a moment, when these other gentlemen get through talking.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman would not be inclined to agree to it if we now limit it to 1 year?

Mr. RANKIN. I think it should go over until after the recess. I think we had better turn the sunlight of pitiless publicity onto this scheme to regiment the American farmers, somewhat as Stalin is doing in the Ukraine.

If this program continues to spread the farmers will soon have no freedom at all.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here pro and con about the so-called peanut bill. A careful consideration of this matter will convince anyone, I am sure, that it is reasonable and that we have a situation that needs remedying.

There are two situations facing us. We have an over-all peanut program dealing with peanuts as a whole, when, in fact, peanuts are divided into several different types. We had a great shortage, as has been declared by the manufacturers and the salters and the baseball peanut handlers. They say they need peanuts. This bill simply provides that we may raise sufficient nuts to meet the demands of the trade. That, it seems to me, is fair and just, and certainly no less than our farmers expect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Why do you not let all the American farmers raise peanuts if they want to, as they have always done until this communistic program was started? No, you deny to them the right to raise peanuts for the market. If a farmer who has not been raising peanuts does so and sells them, he can be sent to jail for it.

Mr. ABBITT. This bill increases the acreage. Every grower of peanuts on any farm is allowed to grow peanuts.

It is obvious that the present bill is not understood by some of the Members. I feel sure that none of our farmers nor those interested in the peanut industry desire to maintain a program subsidized by the taxpayers of the United States of America. This bill is intended as a long step toward eliminating subsidies. Under our present program peanuts are treated as one commodity. When an allotment is declared by the Secretary, he makes an allotment to peanuts as a whole. We have a great shortage in the edible type peanuts that are used for salting, baseball park peanuts, candies,

and so forth. Manufacturers of these products are demanding more peanuts of that type. On the other hand, we have a surplus of peanuts as a whole. Under the present law, the Secretary necessarily tries to hit a medium between too many oil peanuts and too few edible peanuts. This, of course, keeps us in short supply in our edible type nuts and a surplus of other type peanuts.

This bill will eliminate that almost entirely. It will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make an allotment of peanuts as a whole then, having made the allotment and having reduced the peanuts that are not in demand whereby they will not be a burden on our farm program or taxpayers, if it appears that any type is in short supply, and I assure you that there is a type in real short supply, then the Secretary shall allot to that type sufficient acres to meet the demands of the trade.

AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE OF RUSSIA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, so many releases of one sort or another are issued by our Government every day that it is easy to overlook the few really important ones among the many relatively unimportant ones.

I hope that one issued yesterday will not go unnoticed—the letter signed by the Secretary of State which declared American friendship and good will toward the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries behind the iron curtain.

This letter is the first instance I have seen of direct, forthright appeal to the people of Russia over the heads of their own tyrannical government.

Mr. Speaker, there can never again be security or relaxation for us, or any people, until that tyrannical government is overthrown. It can be overthrown either from the outside, which would mean terrible cost and sacrifice to all of us in manpower and money, or from the inside. Surely the latter is the better way.

However, until we people of the free world repeatedly, effectively, and convincingly make clear to the Russian people that we want them to join us in an honorable peace with full cooperation, good will and brotherhood, we cannot expect them to rise up and overthrow the tyranny and despotism under which they suffer.

I commend the Secretary of State, and hope there will be more actions of this type taken by our Government in the future.

If something with this same objective were done every day it would not be too often.

REGIMENTATION OF THE AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this program of regimenting the American farmers. This plan of making a closed shop of tobacco growing for the benefit of a certain element in certain areas is wrong. It simply enriches the few at the expense of the many. We are told that the man who has the privilege of raising tobacco can sell his land for three or four times as much as his neighbor who joins him, who does not have the privilege of growing tobacco, can get for the same number of acres of the same kind of land.

The average American does not know that there is an embargo on tobacco seed, which prohibits their being shipped to foreign countries.

This program of making a closed shop out of peanut growing for the benefit of a few people in certain areas is all wrong.

They can grow just as good peanuts in the district I represent as they can in Georgia, or elsewhere. But, if they have not been growing and selling them, and do not have the permit to grow them, they cannot raise them and sell them without running the risk of going to jail.

This crazy program is now being used to regiment the cotton farmers. Many of the little cotton farmers were driven from their fields last year, and the year before, because their acreage was so reduced that they could not raise enough cotton to pay the taxes on their land. And yet, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, of Colorado, who probably never saw a stalk of cotton growing in his life until he came to Washington, and would not know one if he saw it, who wouldn't know a boll weevil from a bumblebee, placed an embargo on cotton that forced the price down \$100 a bale—thereby robbing the poor cotton farmers of the South of untold millions of dollars.

By the way, he claimed to have issued that order in response to an order issued by the President, describing cotton as a "food." Just when they got to eating cotton around the White House still remains a mystery.

Now Mr. Brannan has been joined by Mr. DiSalle, whose real name, I understand, is DiSalvo. He went from East Side, New York, to Ohio, and was brought to Washington and given the power of fixing the price of cotton, about which he knows absolutely nothing. He is following in the Brannan footsteps, and has now fixed the price of cotton in this country at about \$96 a bale less than it sells for in Mexico and \$137 a bale less than it brings in Brazil. If he and Brannan keep on with this crazy program, I look for them to soon be trying to teach the cotton farmers how to milk ducks.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time these communistic movements were brought to an end. I am not going to agree to the passage of this bill to further regiment the farmers of this country who want to raise cotton, or peanuts, or tobacco,

and prevent them from growing sufficient crops to support their families.

The next thing they will be trying to tell the farmers of this country how many cows they can milk, how many chickens they can raise, how many eggs they can sell, how many hogs they can kill, how much corn they can grow, and so regimenting them generally that their freedom will be forever gone.

A Member of Congress told me of a farmer in his area who planted a portion of his land in peanuts, because his cotton acreage was reduced so low he could not make a living. After he gathered his peanuts, he found that if he tried to sell them, he would be sent to jail. He had to feed them to his hogs.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] told us the other day of a little farmer in his district, who raised one bale of cotton, who had not been assigned any land, and because he sold that bale of cotton, he was fined \$100.

This program is not holding up the price of cotton; it is holding it down. If we could get rid of both Brannan and DiSalvo, and remove these restrictions on the price of cotton, our farmers would get from \$100 to \$150 a bale more for their cotton than they are permitted to sell it for now, under the DiSalvo-Brannan plan.

The sooner Congress wakes up and gets away from this program of attempting to regiment the American farmers and of penalizing them unnecessarily, and unmercifully—the sooner Congress gets away from that program and restores to the American farmer his freedom of action and his right to make a living—the better it is going to be for all concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

REVISION OF THE RECORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I realize every one is anxious to get away for the Easter recess, and I shall not delay you very long. However, circumstances in connection with a certain colloquy between me and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as it occurred on yesterday on the floor, and as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, require that I make a statement at this time. I do not know how many of you were on the floor yesterday. I hope a number of you were because if you were and heard what took place you will quickly comprehend what I am getting at.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say that as I understand the rules of the House, if one is given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in debate on the floor, he has great latitude, generally speaking, in making those revisions. Certainly if what he said is not involved in anything subsequently said by another Member or at the time that he himself was speaking was not in colloquy or debate or in questions and answers, the Member should have the

broadest latitude in making whatever revisions or corrections he sees fit to make. But it has always been my understanding, if not of the rules, at least of the matter of equity and fair dealing among ourselves as Members of the House of Representatives, that we should avoid revisions which would, let us say, materially change statements upon which a subsequent statement made by another Member is predicated.

In other words, when we get ready to make revisions which involve discussions with other Members in the course of debate, we should be most careful to see to it that those revisions are not of such tenor or of such character as even to go so far as to render ridiculous or without foundation, seemingly, what a Member said during, or subsequent to the colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, to get down to this particular matter, a question arose in the course of debate on the appropriation bill as to the investigators used by the Committee on Appropriations. A suggestion was made that agents of departments of Government were called in as investigators presumably to investigate other departments of the Government. Then the suggestion further was made that such investigations by personnel of one agency of Government investigating another agency of Government might be a case of bureaucrats investigating other bureaucrats. After that debate was had and that question was raised, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] took the floor and his remarks as revised by him appear beginning at page 2813 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21, 1951, which was yesterday. His remarks made on the floor clearly indicated that the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was undertaking to create the impression that the investigators used by the Committee on Appropriations were solely people from the FBI.

After that opening statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I addressed an inquiry to him. But before I get to that and in order that you may see how this has developed, let me say that I have here the stenographic transcript of the debate of yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. As I say, I have here the stenographic transcript of the debate of yesterday which was corrected by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as a matter of revision, the transcript also containing certain questions addressed by me to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], which I may say parenthetically are here contained and are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without any first single revision by me.

In that opening statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON],

here is what he said on the floor, according to the transcript:

Mr. Chairman, we do not use anyone in our investigations but FBI men, so any strictures which he may have uttered were against the FBI.

The reference to our colleague was to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], who had raised the question.

Here is the way you will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as revised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], our colleague:

Mr. Chairman, our investigations are spearheaded exclusively by FBI men, so any strictures of the gentleman were against the FBI.

In other words, in the revision the FBI is only spearheading the investigations, whereas what he said on the floor was:

We do not use anyone in our investigations but FBI men.

Before I go on let me just say this, that I raised the question as to whether or not other personnel from other agencies of the Government were not likewise used by the Committee on Appropriations, and the answers were that they were not.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I may be able to throw a little light on this.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know who would have made such a statement, but that is utterly incorrect. Other agencies of the Government have been used in connection with investigations by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HALLECK. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will wait here until I have concluded because I want the gentleman to hear what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did say. The reason I am undertaking to correct it is that I made a subsequent statement on the floor of the House referring to a report of the Committee on Appropriations. I am referring, I may say to the gentleman from New York, to a statement of the gentleman from Missouri which is found at page 2813 in the RECORD.

I have referred to the questions that I addressed to the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON], and here is what I said:

Let me ask, just for information: Does the Appropriations Committee in asking for the services of other people in the Government or agencies of the Government limit itself wholly to people in the FBI? Or does the committee on occasion ask for the help and assistance of persons in the agencies of the Government other than the FBI?

And here is what the transcript shows that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

As far as I know, we have never used anyone but FBI agents.

Now he inserted this:

Every requisition for investigation is referred to the FBI man at the head of our staff. All investigations are in charge of FBI agents.

I think it is obvious to everyone that that was an attempt to qualify the categorical statement that was actually made.

Subsequent to that time it came to my attention as the matter progressed on the floor that these semiannual reports were made by the Appropriations Committee; so I asked this question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

Is it a fact that the gentleman or his committee, or he for the committee, twice a year files a report of reimbursement to other agencies of the Government for personnel used? Is that correct?

And here is what you will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after the gentleman's revision as his answer:

Mr. CANNON. We file under the rules of the House semiannually a report of employment of all members of our staff.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I need only two.

Mr. CANNON. I modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and ask that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Here is what the chairman further said which was stricken out by him—and I am not quarreling with his right to revise except, I might say to the gentleman from Missouri as I said in my opening statement here, except as it had a direct bearing upon what was subsequently said on the floor:

We do not file, we are not required to file, although we have no objection to filing a list of those we use in investigations; but they have invariably been FBI people.

Now the matter of whom the Appropriations Committee uses is not to me a matter of any great concern, although as a Member of the House of Representatives and on my own responsibility, I might question how unprejudiced the investigations conducted by the personnel of one agency would be in respect to the operations of some other agency.

But here is what transpired: The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] had raised a question about the practice of using the personnel of these agencies. The gentleman from Missouri undertaking, as I said yesterday, to hide behind the skirts of the FBI, and certainly to put the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] in bad light, tried to make it appear that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] was questioning the FBI and its people.

The gentleman from Missouri by his statements and by his answers to me, and I think the RECORD is clear on this, undertook to make it appear and in fact said that the Appropriations Committee used in its investigative work only people from the FBI. Yet the report filed by the chairman of the committee on January 14 of this year for the committee discloses that about \$10,000 went to FBI people and some \$52,000 went to people or personnel employed or taken by the

committee from other agencies of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I did not know the gentleman from Indiana expected to refer to me in debate this morning. I have just come in and did not hear the gentleman's earlier remarks. The gentleman is perfectly within his rights in calling attention to the revision of remarks in the RECORD this morning. As he well says, all the remarks made yesterday on this subject were revised, and I think no one revised them more fully than did the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] to whom the gentleman from Indiana has referred. My revision was made in order to clarify a fact with which I was not familiar when I answered the gentleman yesterday. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] revised his remarks in an attempt to bolster up the case he was trying to make at the time. The point which the gentleman from Indiana seems to be trying to bring out is that I was in error in my response to a question by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in which I expressed the belief that all investigations by the Committee on Appropriations were made by the FBI.

To understand the situation it is necessary to go back and see what gave rise to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana. Here is what brought up the discussion: Among other purely partisan statements by Members on that side it was charged that the investigation system of the Committee on Appropriations was controlled by the majority members of the committee for political purposes and that FBI agents in making the investigations was in effect bureaucrats investigating bureaucrats "scratching each other's backs."

I think we demonstrated fully in the debate yesterday that this was not true.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is a fact that investigations are ordered on the application of the chairman and the ranking minority members of a subcommittee and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the full committee.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. But is it not a fact that their investigation is entirely under the control of the majority?

Mr. CANNON. That is the very point I want to answer and the very point that occasions this misunderstanding in my response yesterday.

The men in charge of our investigation system are FBI men—every one of them—and when we order an investigation, either at the suggestion of the

minority or the majority—and most of them this year have been at the suggestion of the minority rather than the majority—when the requisition is made it goes to an FBI man invariably. FBI men are in charge, as the gentleman is aware.

Here is the point I did not know at the time. I did not know that these FBI men in the discharge of their duties sometimes call upon men from other departments to assist them, and who act under their direction. The fact that I did not know it shows that the majority exercises no control whatever over these investigations. I knew that we submitted these requests to the FBI men in charge. I had so little familiarity with this phase of it and refrained so completely from exercising any supervision or control over the staff and the investigations that I was not aware that the FBI men in the conduct of the investigations called in men from other departments. That is obviously patent to anyone, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who was on the floor at the time, served as chairman of the committee in the Eightieth Congress and was thoroughly familiar with such details.

It proves beyond peradventure of doubt that there has been no attempt upon the part of the majority to control or to influence in any way or in any respect any of these investigations. They are impartial, nonpolitical and nonpartisan.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Has the gentleman seen the report that he signed, presumably filed for his Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. I have.

Mr. HALLECK. Did you see it when you signed it?

Mr. CANNON. I did.

Mr. HALLECK. Did you read it when you signed it?

Mr. CANNON. I did not. Such reports, as everybody knows, are purely formal. They are prepared by the clerks of the committee and are signed along with other such documents without reading. No one takes time to read such routine reports when they are merely lists of names and are repeated year after year and are largely identical.

They are merely factual, merely statistical as to the number of people and individual employees on the staff with their compensation. It is published in the RECORD for all to see, and of course it is silly to say that anyone would endeavor to conceal anything that is in it.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the report which he filed, which is headed, "Investigative Staff," puts the FBI people right in along with the people from all the other agencies, and there is not a single thing in the report that the gentleman filed from his committee to indicate any superior position by the FBI people.

As far as the report is concerned, they are all in there on a par because they are

all treated in the same way, in the same column.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; but everybody knows, certainly every member of the Committee on Appropriations knows, that ever since this system was inaugurated, all the men in the central office of the committee staff are FBI men and are in charge of all investigations. And the fact that stands out here like the headlight on a locomotive at midnight is that whether they are FBI men or not is wholly immaterial. The important thing is that we have an investigation system that is effective and impartial; that it produces every fact anybody has ever asked for, and that its findings and reports are authoritative and complete, and that the evidence adduced has invariably been comprehensive and accurate. That is the subject before the House and whether the men who operate it are FBI or not is utterly inconsequential. It is to be regretted that the gentlemen on that side of the aisle do not debate the question raised on the floor yesterday instead of devoting all their time and attention to a minor detail which does not affect the issue before the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if I understand the gentleman correctly, he is now saying that he made certain statements yesterday that were not in line with the true facts.

Mr. CANNON. I made a statement yesterday about a matter with which I was not familiar, but it was so inconsequential in its effect upon the proposition before the House at the time that I corrected it in revising my remarks, as is customary.

The important thing is the integrity and accuracy of our system of investigation. I would be glad to have the gentlemen debate that point.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman determined, as he obviously did by the revision which he made, that he had been in error in certain matters, and particularly in view of the fact that his statements might have severely prejudiced the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], a colleague of his on the committee. Why then, instead of making these revisions as he did, did he not come in here today and say, particularly in view of what I subsequently said in the debate, "I was in error in some of those things I said yesterday, and I want to correct them"?

Mr. CANNON. That is exactly what I am saying now. And my revision did not prejudice the gentleman from New York any more, if as much, as his revision of his remarks prejudiced me. I again call attention to the fact that the inadvertent statement was comparatively unimportant, and the gentlemen are looking at the fly speck on the picture and are carefully avoiding the invaluable contributions made by our system of investigation to the economical processing of the annual appropriations and the retrenchment of national expenditures.

In conclusion, I append a letter on the subject just received from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the honored and distinguished Director of the Bureau under discussion:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1951.
Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just finished reading the remarks which you made on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 21, 1951, in your discussion with Representative COUDERT of New York. I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your very commendatory statement concerning the operations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of its staff, and of my administration of it. It is indeed regrettable that any Member of Congress should have seen fit to cast aspersions upon this organization when we have so diligently, and, I believe effectively throughout the years that I have been the Director of it under both Democratic and Republican administrations, striven to maintain its fairness, objectivity, and nonpartisan complexion.

As you well know, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has furnished to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives investigators under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and this is the first time that I have noted criticism of making members of the FBI's staff available to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives on the grounds that the investigators so assigned were prejudiced in their viewpoint or were not qualified in auditing, accounting, and efficiency surveys. We have on our staff at the present time 647 accountants, and over the years this Bureau has been called upon by United States attorneys throughout the 93 judicial districts to make some of the most intricate accounting and auditing examinations and efficiency surveys of various Governmental agencies. I believe an examination of the reports made by this Bureau in the performance of its duties would convince any fair-minded man that there was not an iota of bias or prejudice in the reports.

I am indeed grateful to you for your action in endeavoring to present a correct picture of what the Federal Bureau of Investigation has tried to do through its years of operation.

Sincerely,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the remarks just previously made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and should like to call his attention to certain facts with regard to House Appropriations Committee investigations.

May I first say as chairman of one of the important subcommittees on appropriations that I have never known of an instance in my years on the Committee on Appropriations where any member of the minority asked for an investigation of an agency or activity that the request was not immediately concurred in by the chairman and all the other members of the committee.

In connection with the statements concerning the use of other Government

employees as members of investigative teams, I should like to point out how and when other Government employees come into the investigative picture. Incidentally, I have never yet seen a report of an investigation for the committee which was not critical of the agency to which it was directed, in my time on the Committee on Appropriations.

We had an instance in our investigation of the National Bureau of Standards about a year ago when the question came up as to whether or not the Bureau of Standards was spending excessive sums for the maintenance of their grounds here in the District. Certainly the average FBI agent would not be an expert investigator as to that subject, so the director of the committee's investigative staff, an FBI man, brought in a man from the Department of Defense since the Army and Navy have great installations where the matter of cost of maintenance of grounds comes into play. He then became a member of the investigative team directed by the FBI man.

To take another instance, if you are going to investigate an agency from the management viewpoint, an FBI man is not usually a management specialist or efficiency expert. They then communicate with some one from the Bureau of the Budget or the General Accounting Office, to get a man who has a background with regard to management to make up an investigative team.

I conclude with this statement: I have never as yet met any of the investigators who have conducted investigations for my subcommittee. The practice is to outline a request in writing, the purpose of the investigation. It is then signed by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member, by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the full committee, and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. From that moment of signing until the report in typewritten form is presented to me as chairman, with two additional copies thereof, I have never spoken to any one of the investigators. Immediately upon receipt of the copies of the report one is handed to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the other is held by the clerk of the subcommittee for the use of subcommittee members.

If there is anything wrong or unfair about that system of investigation, I should like to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] point it out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield, I am quite sure the gentleman knows of my regard for him, and I would

want the gentleman from Missouri to know of my regard for him.

Mr. ROONEY. The feeling is mutual. Mr. HALLECK. Certainly there is nothing personal in anything I have said here.

Let me just say this to the gentleman: I am not undertaking to dictate the manner of investigation carried on in the Appropriations Committee. I do not know enough about it to question it. I did, in what I just said a moment ago, raise some question about how these folks are working, but I am perfectly willing to admit that I am not an expert on that. However, may I say to the gentleman from New York that I came into this yesterday because in response to questions addressed to him by me the gentleman from Missouri certainly led me to believe by what he said—and I think generally led the membership to believe by what he said—that the investigative staff from other agencies of the Government included only people from the FBI.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] never intended to misinform the gentleman. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who was chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations during the Eightieth Congress, certainly knows that personnel of other agencies are sometimes used in connection with investigations.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. That is the reason we got the copy of this report. Far be it from me to undertake to determine just what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] undertook to convey, but when one makes a point-blank statement in response to a question about the reports filed by the committee that the people used are invariably FBI people—

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that each investigation, I am given to understand, is always in charge of a man from the FBI. I am further given to understand we have never had the same investigators twice, that these men come up from the FBI, go into an investigation, and are never seen or heard from again. I have never personally seen any of them or spoken to any of them.

Mr. HALLECK. I should again like to make it perfectly clear that my entry into the matter was as a result of certain information that I had and, directly, as the result of what apparently was an effort to prejudice the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] by making it appear as though he was attacking the FBI. So in my subsequent speech I said that the gentleman from Missouri either did not know what the facts were or he did not choose to disclose them to the membership.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri will accept the gentleman's apology.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WERDEL was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on April 3, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to ex-

tend his remarks in two instances and include certain extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address he made on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four separate instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from John L. Collier to Eric Johnston.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech entitled "The Case for Western Democracy Against Russian Communism," by Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Ohio, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$266.50.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include in one a letter he received regarding the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from the Jackson City Bank & Trust Co. and his reply thereto.

Mr. GRANT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter he wrote to General Marshall and one he received from a serviceman.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one an article by Jeanne Toomey appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle, and in the other an editorial under date of March 18, 1951, from the same newspaper.

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. NORBLAD (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 83, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 2, 1951.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 83, the House adjourned until Monday, April 2, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

318. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, and the predecessor agency, United States Maritime Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1117) (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

319. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing site purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

320. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$775,000 for the Department of Justice in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. 94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

321. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$20,000,000 for the General Services Administration (H. Doc. 95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

322. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the Eleventh Semiannual Report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period July-December 1950, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

323. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, so as to further define the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and stockmen who suffer losses from production disasters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

324. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the procurement of the land and the construction of buildings necessary for: the civil defense technical training school; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3434. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to prohibit the employment of certain personnel of the Corporation by organizations receiving loans or other financial assistance therefrom; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3435. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the use of rights-of-way through, over, and under the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal lands for utilities, tunnels, and water conduits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 3436. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between the United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3437. A bill to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3438. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3439. A bill to advance officers and enlisted men on the retired lists of the Armed Forces to the highest grade for which they satisfactorily performed the duties in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3440. A bill to provide that no Senator or Representative shall be immune from civil liability for any defamatory statement inserted by him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when such statement was not actually made in the Chamber of the Senate or House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3441. A bill for the establishment of a Commission to make a study and recommend a code of morality and ethics applicable to the conduct of appointed and elected officials of the United States Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3442. A bill to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases hereafter adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3443. A bill for the establishment of a Commission to make a study and recommend a code of morality and ethics applicable to the conduct of appointed and elected officials of the United States Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3444. A bill to provide salary increases for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3445. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under said act from taxation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 3446. A bill relating to the tax treatment applicable to sales and exchanges of certain property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint Resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric

contaminants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution relating to the establishment of a defense plant or plants in Allegany County, Md.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, urging removal of farm price supports of basic foods, to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to providing for the distribution of cigarettes free of tax to patients in certain soldiers' homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to authorizing the Department of the Interior to make continuing investigations relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of the Territory of Hawaii and to provide funds therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 3447. A bill to provide additional time for presenting certain tort claims

against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3448. A bill for the relief of John Kitcoff and Mrs. Helen Kitcoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3449. A bill for the relief of Jesse J. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3450. A bill for the relief of Kui Hung Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3451. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Walter J. Bickford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3452. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Rodriguez Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

161. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 24 Christian women, residents of Beaver County, Pa., who are opposed to the segregation clause in the draft bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

162. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress of the United States to remove the farm price support of basic foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

163. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts me-

morializing Congress to enact legislation to provide for the distribution of cigarettes free of tax to patients in certain soldiers' homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

164. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging removal of farm price supports of basic foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

165. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation providing for the distribution of cigarettes free of tax to patients in certain soldiers' homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

166. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. J. B. Wooldridge, president, the Fine Arts Club, Anahuac, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to going on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1951

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Thursday last, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 10 seconds p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.